

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CHARLES J. SMITH,

Petitioner,

-against-

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

Respondent.

21-CV-7501 (LTS)

TRANSFER ORDER

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN, Chief United States District Judge:

Petitioner, who is currently incarcerated at Greene Correctional Facility, brings this *pro se* petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, challenging his 1996 conviction in the New York Supreme Court, New York County. The Court transfers this action to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit for the reason set forth below.

Petitioner seeks to challenge the legality of his October 10, 1996 state court conviction. The Court's records show that Petitioner filed a previous application for relief under Section 2254 challenging the same conviction. *See Smith v. Chappius*, 1:13-CV-7595, 37 (JMF) (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 6, 2014) (holding that petition was time-barred, that there was no basis for equitable tolling, and that claim of actual innocence was not credible or compelling). Because Petitioner's previous application for relief under Section 2254 was decided on the merits, this application is a second or successive petition. *See Graham v. Costello*, 299 F.3d 129, 133 (2d Cir. 2002).

Before a second or successive Section 2254 *habeas* petition is filed in the district court, authorization from the appropriate court of appeals is required. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A).

Petitioner must therefore move in the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit for permission to pursue this application.<sup>1</sup>

### CONCLUSION

The petition is transferred, in the interest of justice, to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1631; *see also Liriano v. United States*, 95 F.3d 119, 122-23 (2d Cir. 1996) (*per curiam*). This order closes the case in this Court. If the Court of Appeals authorizes Petitioner to proceed in this matter, he shall move to reopen this case under this civil docket number.

Because Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, a certificate of appealability will not issue. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253. The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962). The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Petitioner and note service on the docket.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 9, 2021  
New York, New York

/s/ Laura Taylor Swain  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN  
Chief United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Any motion to the Court of Appeals must show that: (A) the claim being raised by the petition “relies on a new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable,” 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2)(A); or (B) “the factual predicate for the claim could not have been discovered previously through the exercise of due diligence,” and “the facts underlying the claim, if proven and viewed in light of the evidence as a whole, would be sufficient to establish by clear and convincing evidence that, but for constitutional error, no reasonable factfinder would have found the applicant guilty of the underlying offense.” 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(2)(B)(i)-(ii).